

REMARKS

It is not clear whether the office action is continuing to rely on the position that the "adapted to" language is entitled to no weight. While it persists in the original body of the rejection and the response to amendment does not retract that position, it is unclear whether reliance on that position is maintained. In any case, it should be noted that the newest version of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure expressly adopts the position taken by the Applicant in his last response. Specifically, the "adapted to" language is noted in M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(g) and indicated to be an effective limitation.

With respect to the argument that Higashi shows wiping contact, it is respectfully submitted that, for example, referring to Figure 10, it is clear that the free ends intersect into the face of the flat lands 31 at the bottom of the page. This cannot be described as rubbing contact, but, instead, would be more aptly described as poking or jabbing contact. Instead of contacting on the side of the contact, the contact is entirely on its end. This is less effective than rubbing contact as described in the present specification at page 3, lines 6-8.

Furthermore, the suggestion that wiping has been argued as having some special meaning is traversed. Wiping was defined from the dictionary and the dictionary page was attached to the last response. Thus, the word "wiping" is given only its ordinary definition. It requires some kind of rubbing, as opposed to jabbing. With response to a curved object and a wiping contact with a straight object, this clearly means tangential contact.

As shown in Figure 1 of the present application, the contact between the solder balls 12 and the portions 25a is tangential. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that what is shown and taught is a tangential or rubbing contact, as opposed to the jabbing contact shown in the reference.

Note that in the reference, the contact between the S-shaped elements and the solder balls is in the directly facing portion of the solder balls, not along their sides. In contrast, as shown in Figure 1, no such effect occurs.


In the attached exhibits, exhibit A is a copy of the application as filed with an arrow in blue near one of the solder balls 12. Also attached is exhibit B which is an enlarged copy of the reference so that the reference may be overlaid with the copy from the present application. The arrow marks the corresponding point where the S-shaped element 20 would have impacted the solder balls 12 if the solder balls 12 and the solder ball shown in the reference were of the same

diameter. Thus, it can be seen that the contact with the solder ball in the claimed invention is much more glancing, tangential, or rubbing than is the contact indicated in the cited reference. Instead, the cited reference jabs directly into the opposed portion of the solder ball, making wiping contact impossible.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 16, 2005



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation